



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,783	09/28/2001	Stanko Bodnar	CRD-0967	5435
27777	7590	09/06/2006		EXAMINER
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003				CHORBAJI, MONZER R
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1744	

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/966,783	BODNAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MONZER R. CHORBAJI	1744	
<b>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</b>			
<b>THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</b>			
<b>1. <input type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</b>			
<b>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3 months</u> from the mailing date of the final rejection.</b>			
<b>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than <u>SIX MONTHS</u> from the mailing date of the final rejection.</b>			
<b>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</b>			
<b>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</b>			
<b><u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u></b>			
<b>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</b>			
<b><u>AMENDMENTS</u></b>			
<b>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</b>			
<b>(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</b>			
<b>(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</b>			
<b>(c) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</b>			
<b>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</b>			
<b>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</b>			
<b>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</b>			
<b>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</b>			
<b>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</b>			
<b>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</b>			
<b>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</b>			
<b>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</b>			
<b>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</b>			
<b>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-40</u>.</b>			
<b>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</b>			
<b><u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u></b>			
<b>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</b>			
<b>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</b>			
<b>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</b>			
<b><u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u></b>			
<b>11. <input type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:</b> _____			
<b>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</b>			
<b>13. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</b>			
 <b>GLADYS J.P. CORCORAN</b> <b>SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER</b>			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has amended independent claim 1 by deleting a vacuum creation step. The disclosure does not teach such an embodiment. In addition, such an amendment raises a new issue that require further evaluation and additional search.

#### Response to Arguments

On page 12 of the Remarks/Arguments section, applicant argues that, Muth sterilizes a device coated with protein whereas McGowan sterilizes a device and that McGowan sterilizes by using ethylene-oxide and steam at temperatures higher than the temperature ranges recited in the instant claims. Applicant is referred to page 3 of the action dated 06/20/2006 where temperature ranges recited in the instant claims are taught by Muth. Arguments with respect to temperature ranges utilized by McGowan are irrelevant. As noted by the Applicants, temperature ranges cited by McGowan overlap with the temperature ranges disclosed in the instant claims. In addition, both Muth and McGowan are in the art of sterilizing items with ethylene oxide just like the current disclosure and both are analogous art that do not teach against each other since McGowan is combined with Muth for preconditioning step, for creating vacuum, for using nitrogen washes and not for the temperature ranges. McGowan teaches that such steps are conventional in the art of ethylene oxide sterilization.

On page 12 of the Remarks/Arguments section, applicant argues that, "Applicant requires a more specific showing of why all of the references should be combined." Applicant is referred to page 4 of the action dated 06/20/2006 where motivations are provided by McGowan and by Mitchell. Furthermore, with regard to the feature of a compound that inhibits MROR and binds FKBP12, Mitchell is combined in combination with the Sigma-Aldrich Internet printout to show that Rapamycin does have such inherent properties. Again, the motivation is provided by Mitchell as clearly explained on page 4 of the action dated 06/20/2006. Obviously, the motivations are from the prior art made of record.